

In Re Application Of Scott H. Holmberg
Serial No. 07/218,312

discharges between said row and column activation lines during manufacture of the displays[; and

removing said outer guard ring and row and column interconnections prior to completion of the display].

REMARKS

The Examiner rejected claims 30-34 under 35 U.S.C. Section 112 as indefinite. Claim 30 has been amended to positively recite the elements in lines 2-8 and to delete lines 9 and 10. The 35 U.S.C. Section 112 rejection now should be obviated.

Claims 1-6, 8-17, 19-24 and 26-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103 as obvious over Tuan in view of Hynecek or Harrison and Mack. Tuan in Fig. 5(a) is concerned with electrostatic discharge protection of an active matrix display. The resistive stripes 70 are not however removable as required by independent claims 1 and 19, as noted by the Examiner. The Examiner combines two semiconductor circuits in an attempt to supply such a teaching. Hynecek removes the interconnect 4 between devices 3, but does not provide row and column line connections or remove such connection if resistance 11 is taken to be such a connection. Likewise, Harrison is an integrated circuit, which has elements which could be separated at score line 270, but the elements are not an outer discharge ring connected as claimed. Tuan as noted in column 1 thereof, was familiar with various semiconductor circuits and chose to form the permanent non-removable resistive strips. It is not felt that a proper combination can be made from the teachings of Tuan, Harrison and Hynecek taken as a whole as required. Independent claims 1 and 19 and the claims dependent therefrom clearly should be allowable. Also, specifically dependent claims 8 and 26 add a second permanent inner guard ring, which dual ring is not suggested by any of the references alone or combined. Mack is recited to provide a teaching of such an inner guard ring as also claimed in independent claims 10 and 28. Mack again is a semiconductor type device and is not

In Re Application Of Scott H. Holmberg
Serial No. 07/218,312

directed to an active matrix backplane as claimed. Further, the subsurface PN junctions 46 and/or 56 are external to the circuit and cannot be utilized in an active matrix backplane structure. Independent claims 10 and 28 clearly should be allowable as well as the claims dependent therefrom. Further, dependent claims 12 and 30 add the second outer guard ring which, as stated above, clearly is not disclosed or suggested by the references alone or in combination.

It is noted with appreciation that claims 7, 18, 25 and 36 are deemed to have allowable subject matter, however, the independent claims are felt to be allowable as above stated.

Claims 1-36 as now written clearly distinguish over the references of record, both structurally and functionally, and are in allowable form. The lacking teaching is not supplied or suggested by the references alone or in combination. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claims.

Signed at Boca Raton in the County of Palm Beach and State of Florida, this 25th day of June, 1990.

Respectfully submitted,



John T. Winburn - Reg. No. 26822
One of the Attorneys for Applicant
Leydig, Voit & Mayer
One IBM Plaza, Suite 4600
Chicago, Illinois 60611

Boca Raton, Florida
(407) 392-5332